

House of Commons Debates.

THIRD SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

SPEECH OF HON. G. E. FOSTER, D.C.L., M.P.

REPLY IN CLOSING BUDGET DEBATE

TUESDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER. An apology is certainly due to the House, after ten days of a long discussion upon this tariff policy, for asking it at this late period in the discussion to listen a second time to any remarks from myself. However, it becomes necessary that I should say a few words, not only in reply to my hon. friend who has just sat down, but also in reply to several points which have been raised by hon. gentlemen who have spoken from the beginning of the debate until this time. Happily, I am not under obligation to occupy the attention of this House at very great length in that respect, for neither the cogency nor the novelty of the arguments which have been addressed to the House by hon. gentlemen opposite call for, in most cases, any lengthy reply; and I must also say that most of those arguments have been fully, fairly and completely met, not only many times before in this House, but during this present debate by hon. gentlemen who sit on this side.

IS IT FREE TRADE?

First, I wish to pay my respects for a few moments to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. My hon. friend has been going about the country sounding the praises and trumpeting the coming triumph of free trade. To-night his vaunted free trade with all its breadth of vision and majesty of thought has resolved itself into trade with one country, to the exclusion, by restrictions, of trade with every other in the world. Before his Toronto and Hamilton audiences he breathed the spirit of a wider atmosphere. He pointed to the battlefields of the United States, and he declared that there had been fought and won the second victory, not for "freedom of trade" as he haltingly tells us to-night, but for "free trade" and rising on the height and expanding on the

breadth of that glorious victory for free trade in the United States, he unfolded the curtains of prophecy and declared that the third great country in the world to adopt free trade would be the Dominion of Canada. But to-night, Sir, my hon. friend talks small, very small, indeed. His vision is blinded to the wonderful commerce of Great Britain, his vision is blinded to the wonderful scope of a commercial world beyond the seas in every other country in the globe, and he is willing, for the sake of unrestricted free trade with the United States to raise a Chinese wall against Great Britain and every other country in the world. For in all his long speech to-night has he used two paragraphs of argument in favour of free trade, and has not his whole speech been an apology for unrestricted reciprocity, upon which he has already met significant defeat and upon which he will receive significant defeat yet in the future? The hon. gentleman did several things to-night. He was pleasant and sometimes witty, but at no time very forceful in his remarks or his arguments, if I am able to judge. He told a very good story about King James, but he showed he did not properly appreciate it, because he made the application wrongly. He should have made the application to himself and his friends, who have brought up these theories year after year, from commercial union to continental free trade, and although the people have not agreed with them, although the people have rejected them, although the people have conclusively resolved against them by their votes, yet hon. gentlemen opposite, like King James, still declare that these exploded theories are the only true ones, and they still deploy them before the public view again and again.

THE EXODUS.

The hon. gentleman found fault with a new law of gravitation, which, he said, I have dis-

covered, and he compared me to a second Newton. There must be, he says, according to my doctrine, some centre of attraction out in the west that draws people inevitably from the east towards the west. He said he did not believe that could be true, because the fact was that the people instead of going from east to west were going from north to south. I would advise my hon. friend to take a map and look along the lines of parallels of latitude running through Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick and the United States, and he will find two trends of emigration or transfer, from this country and from the eastern states. He will find a trend going pretty nearly due west, along the same zone, along pretty nearly the same lines of latitude; and he will find a trend going from north to south so far as these provinces are concerned and to the United States on the south of us. My hon. friend, although he treated this in a light and airy way, and not at all, as I think, according to the merits of the subject, will find, if he deals fairly and honestly with it, that these trends are not fanciful, but they are real, that he cannot get rid of them by ridicule and by any pretended law of gravitation I have discovered or not discovered, for those two trends are absolutely fixed by two things,—land hunger, which takes people to the great prairies of the west, and employment hunger, which takes them to the crowded factory towns to the south of us. If there are 1,000 people who go from Canada to the west, 999 of them go from land hunger; and if there are 1,000 who go from Canada to the factory towns to the south, 999 go for employment to towns where industries hum, and where the wheels of the factories resound from day to day. My hon. friend may make fun of my theory of gravitation so long as he pleases; these are, I think, common sense facts, which he and other people will have to face, and of which most people will admit the force and cogency at once. If that be true, he must not ridicule me because I have explained the movement of population upon these two principles, upon those two sets of facts. I think he will find them to be true, and the two lessons I gather from them are, that Canada lost in the early migration, because she had not a great west of her own where people could appease their land hunger; and that if she loses her population in the other direction to-day, it is because we have not had, and have not sufficient factories and industries in order to give employment to the people who hunger for employment. So much with regard to that point. The hon. gentleman, however, has found a scientific and philosophical reason, and it is this: People do not go west because they hunger for land, nor do they go south because of want of employment in the cotton mills and factories as so many of his own countrymen do. Oh, no, there is another reason: They go west, and they go south, for this, and this

alone; that in this country they are sadly oppressed, and they fly south and they fly west to the land of freedom, where there are no burdens, and where all conditions are light and happy and peaceful. Now, that may satisfy my hon. friend, and he may prefer that, to my science of gravitation, but I doubt if there are many sensible men who will agree with him in that explanation. The people are oppressed here! In what way? By taxes? Why, the hon. gentleman exploded his own theory, because he proved to his own satisfaction, and he must have proved it to the infinite discomfiture of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); he proved that the farmers in the United States of America, that the people of the United States, except the manufacturers, were ground down into dust and ashes by the fiscal policy of that country. Oppressed here because a moderate 30 per cent tariff is upon them; and they fly away where they can feel the lighter weight of a 60 per cent tariff! Oppressed here, where their direct taxes are light, and going there where they can have a lighter burden of three or four times the amount of direct taxation upon them! Why, my hon. friend must have taken leave of seriousness when he advanced an argument of that kind. Well, Sir, if he did not prove that this was true, to his own satisfaction, he evidently did prove to his own satisfaction that he told a witty and fanciful story, when he brought in that personage of old, who took up his time in counting 967 widows, and one doubtful one. What that may have had to do with the subject before us I cannot say, but I am bound to assert this: That if that solitary watcher had been my hon. friend who has just sat down, he would not have let that doubtful woman go until he had found out her exact status.

THE CENSUS FIGURES ON INDUSTRIES.

The hon. gentleman hesitates to believe certain figures of the census. He is an eclectic, is my hon. friend. He takes up the Holy Bible, and he takes out one part of the doctrine and he says: That suits me; I believe in the divinity and inspiration of the Scriptures. He turns over another leaf. Ah, this does not suit him, and he says: I do not believe in the divinity or inspiration of the Scriptures. He takes up the census returns, and as he chants his doleful dirges about the exodus, and proves them from the census, ah, then the census is divinely inspired, and it is authoritatively correct. There can be no doubt about its accuracy at all then, but when he comes to the industries, compiled under the very same rules, by the very same set of people, published in the same printing office, and under the auspices of the same Government, he declares that it is full of wickedness, and all hypocrisy, and he will not believe it at all. But my hon. friend can-

not do that. A which he talks and his followers or go down as census. It must as a whole, and the arguments w take what suits not suit him. man says that states that we 000 in the capl ments; but he much was water how much had b if he looks back same remarks w that year. Standi the increased figu ment in these ind then: You do not or not, a good dea stock; it does n before. Well, I probably be about case of the year reference to the ce the average deduc

FARMERS AND

But the hon. ge theory. I think he my hon. friend f Richard Cartwright up some wonderful wealth is not the c come to that a little theory is: That t increase in the t there has been a v value of farmers' la cent, taking it all satisfaction he state of \$125,000,000 in the self as observant and spect as did the lon widows. He declar lost \$125,000,000, v balances this gain o factories. Well, le farmers' values decre mills and the sugar foundries, and other built up, have carri ments, paid certain vided a market for th added to his returns In other words, wou in lands have adv kept from this d had been no cottor foundries in this c I think that you w town where there is munity they are anx ment of industries w that town, and a town every time that a cer for a location. They

not do that. As with the National Policy, which he talks about so often, and which he and his followers say must stand as a whole or go down as a whole, so it is with the census. It must stand as a whole or go down as a whole, and my hon. friend, according to the arguments which he uses, cannot simply take what suits him and leave what does not suit him. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that we may have—the census states that we had—an increase of \$92,000,000 in the capital of industrial establishments; but he says we do not know how much was watered stock, we do not know how much had been sunk before. I suppose if he looks back to 1881 he can make the same remarks with regard to the census of that year. Standing up in 1881, and looking at the increased figure of the amount of investment in these industries, he could have said then: You do not know whether that is right or not, a good deal of that represents watered stock; it does not show what has been sunk before. Well, I think these things would probably be about even. If they hold in the case of the year 1891, they must hold with reference to the census of 1881, and, after all, the average deduction would be about fair.

FARMERS AND FARM VALUES.

But the hon. gentleman has a wonderful theory. I think he must have learned it from my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who has lately picked up some wonderful phrases: Displacement of wealth is not the creation of wealth. I will come to that a little later. My hon. friend's theory is: That though there may be an increase in the industrial establishments, there has been a wonderful decrease in the value of farmers' lands. He says it is 25 per cent, taking it all through, and to his own satisfaction he states that there is a decrease of \$125,000,000 in the gross. He proves himself as observant and as particular in that respect as did the lone watcher for these 967 widows. He declares that the farmers have lost \$125,000,000, which more than overbalances this gain of \$92,000,000 for the manufacturers. Well, let me ask: Have the farmers' values decreased because the cotton mills and the sugar refineries, and the iron foundries, and other industries have been built up, have carried on certain establishments, paid certain wages, and thereby provided a market for the farmers' products, and added to his returns? Is that the reason? In other words, would the farmers' value in lands have advanced, or have been kept from this depreciation, if there had been no cotton mills and no iron foundries in this country? I think not. I think that you will find that in every town where there is an enterprising community they are anxious for the establishment of industries within the precincts of that town, and a town or city is alive to-day every time that a certain industry is looking for a location. They give bonuses in order

to get that industry within their limits. Why? Because they feel that if industries come, and capital builds them up, men and women are employed, and thereby the markets of the surrounding country are helped by the extra demand for the products of the soil. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that my hon. friend has committed a perfect non sequitur in that case. \$92,000,000 advance in the industrial capital invested; \$125,000,000, as he says, depreciation in farm values, and the one, he tells us, is the consequence of the other. Sir, if he is correct in what he says with reference to the \$125,000,000 depreciation, had we had no industries in this country, that \$125,000,000 might have been \$200,000,000. But, Sir, my hon. friend saw the weakness of his argument, and as he attempted to prove that this depression in farm values came from a protective tariff, so he logically was obliged to go on to show that the same thing took place in the United States. That was a hard and cruel task for my hon. friend. Where were his bowels of mercy? Even at that very moment, he looked straight into the eye of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who, the other day, took hours to prove that the farmers of the United States were prosperous to a maximum, and that their lot was as happy and as peaceful as it could be. Here comes on my iconoclast friend to-night, and, without a shred of pity, without a single impulse of sympathy, he knocks to pieces the house which my hon. friend had erected, and declares that in the United States of America the farmers' lot is terrible. He read out the picture, as dark as Erebus, darker than the Shades, and yet may I put this statement to my hon. friend: That any time this last four years, at any time this last five years, while the States was eating out the liver of the farmers, while that was the case, at any time within these five years, my hon. friend would have led the farmers of Canada into the very same conditions, and under the very same tariff. My hon. friend cannot deny that. Well, he saw that there was another flaw to his argument. Then he cited England, to which he declared his opponents would point where farm lands have depreciated. Now, there is no protection in England, and he could not give that reason for the depreciation there. The sequence of his argument would lead him inevitably to this: that if a lesser degree of protection in Canada destroys the farmers to a certain extent, and if a larger degree of protection in the United States destroys them still more, where shall we find the paradise in which they do not suffer the same depreciation and destruction, but in which they are prosperous and happy? Evidently my hon. friend should have been able to point to the happy and prosperous lot of the farmers of Great Britain. He could not do it. If the farmers in the United States have had hard

ask my hon. friend to take particular care of his new adherent, his youngest recruit, the hon. member for L'Islet. I had the curiosity to read that hon. member's card, which he issued to his constituency. He read it to us here the other night. What is the first line of it? The hon. gentleman pledges himself to have legislation introduced which shall raise the value of the farmers' products, and he also pledges himself that the hon. leader of the Opposition will leave two or three columns standing in the temple of the National Policy. Now, I want to ask my hon. friend if he has had an understanding with the hon. member for L'Islet? Did he really agree and authorize him to say he would introduce legislation to raise the value of the farmers' products? What are the columns that he is going to let stand in this temple of protection? I will leave that between my hon. friends. I have no doubt that they will come to an agreement before this session is over. But, Sir, how would free trade, suppose we had it to-day, increase the prices of the products of the farm? You say that the price of wheat is low to-day—why? Because the production of wheat in the world, measured by the demand, is greater in proportion, and consequently the price falls. Bring in free trade, and what is it going to do? Blast a certain portion of the wheat fields; make the quantity less, and thereby bring it closer to the demand, and thus raise the price? That is the only way it can be done. But my hon. friend may have had a fear of that, and so is not going to introduce free trade, but only unrestricted reciprocity.

In that case I am afraid that the hon. gentleman would only fall on the horn of his own dilemma, for he declares that once protection is introduced down goes the value of land, while he promises the farmers that under unrestricted reciprocity, which means a higher protection and greater restriction than we have now, the value of land and land products will rise. Well, Sir, there was a vein running through my hon. friend's remark which is not a new one. It has been a sort of gospel on the part of all hon. gentlemen opposite. They have, as my hon. friend from Charlotte would say, "taken a great cant towards Biddy." They have "taken a cant" upon the line of solitude for the farmer, and if there is one thing that they preach to-day it is the farmer's depressed condition, and they propose to be the only saviours of the farmer by means of the policy which they desire to bring in. Now, Sir, my hon. friend goes too far in his statement with reference to the farmers. He is too solicitous. The Liberal-Conservative party and the Liberal-Conservative Government know the farmers' condition as well as my hon. friend, and they do something for the farmers, while hon. gentlemen opposite merely talk about them, declaring them to be de-

pressed, and painful pictures of them if they Is it true that the oppressed by tax it true, as my horse the farmer pays on all that he wears. What folly that is! The farmer requires fuel for his barn. He has built his house, ten, he uses the wood. He cuts his wood to his farm-yard, with it. Does he use coal, and coal he uses, which is used for fuel power and in great portions of the country almost free, for the pit. My horse, fuel, and he is also absurd that we should argue of that kind are the grains of the world, and of the world. What they eat and the best and firmest these, too, we have also consume our bread can make the best cheese-product and butter equal to the world. The eggs much derided by us and food to the farmer are consumed by there any duty on through everything. What does he pay of food? He pays and allspice and other things of that kind, and ter would represent pays upon these, as goes. He pays in the raw sugars having under the state of year, he pays less would if we had not have taken the farmer his drinks. We drink, according to me, water, tea and coffee to drink anything rational with himself takes, and he has to have a tax on that country. So my horrid dictum, as far as the principal items of the brick or the stone the construction of his buildings.

pressed, and pauperized, and drawing gorgeous pictures of what they would do for them if they were only in power. Is it true that the farmers, as a class, are oppressed by taxation? It is not true. Is it true, as my hon. friend said to-night, that the farmer pays taxes on all that he eats, on all that he wears and on all he consumes? What folly that is, and I will show you why. The farmer requires wood to build his house and his barn. Does he pay a single cent of taxes on the wood in this country where we have a surplus with which to supply the wants of other countries? The farmer requires fuel to give him warmth after he has built his house, and, in nine cases out of ten, he uses the wood of the country as fuel. He cuts his wood in the winter, and brings it to his farm-yard, and keeps himself warm with it. Does he pay any tax on that wood? He uses coal, and every ounce of anthracite coal he uses, which is the coal most largely used for fuel purposes, is free of taxation; and in great portions of this country, bituminous coal lies at his very door, at first cost or almost free, for his taking it at the mouth of the pit. My hon. friend is wrong as regards fuel, and he is also wrong as regards food. It is absurd that we should have to meet an argument of that kind. What our people eat are the grains of this country, the best in the world, and of these we raise a surplus. What they eat are the meats of Canada, the best and firmest in the world, and of these, too, we have a surplus. Our people also consume our butter and cheese, and Canada can make cheese equal to that of the best cheese-producing country in the world, and butter equal to the best butter in the world. The eggs of the patient hen, so much derided by my hon. friend, are meat and food to the farmer, and great quantities are consumed by the labouring men. Is there any duty on those? So we might go through everything that the farmer eats. What does he pay a tax upon in the matter of food? He pays a tax on his mustard and allspice and cinnamon and cloves and things of that kind, and a few cents per quarter would represent the bulk of the duty he pays upon these, as far as his consumption goes. He pays infinitesimal duties on sugar, the raw sugars having been made free; and, under the state of things which exists this year, he pays less for his sugar than he would if we had no National Policy. We have taken the farmer's food; let us consider his drinks. What drinks he ought to drink, according to my opinion, are free. His water, tea and coffee are free. If he desires to drink anything stronger—which is optional with himself—it is a luxury he takes, and he has to pay for it, and we will have a tax on that so long as Canada is a country. So my hon. friend must revise his dictum, as far as the food is concerned. The principal items of the farmer are the wood, the brick or the stone he uses in the construction of his buildings; the fuel he uses, the

food he consumes, and, in all these particulars, which are the main items of his necessary expenditure, where is the country in which the farmer has so bountiful a supply at his own doors and at so small a cost? Go a little further, and consider his clothing. There is a large number of farmers in this country, whose ordinary clothing is made of the wool shorn from the sheep they themselves raise. The fleece is washed in the running brook, taken to the nearest carding mill, and the yarn is spun by his own wife, and woven on his own loom, or that of the factory near by, and the product is made into garments for himself and family. There are thousands and hundreds of thousands of people in this country who are thus clothed, but my hon. friends do not see them. They are not in touch with the farmer. They keep all their eyes for the city people who dress in broadcloth. They roam about the streets of the large towns and villages, and see only people who are dressed in tweeds. If they would get in touch with the people, would use their eyes and go among the working classes, and would visit the back settlements, they would find the gray home-spun coats and trousers made out of the wool shorn from the sheep the farmers themselves have raised and the wool of which was carded in the settlement. Go to your cottons, if you please, go to your woollens, if you wish, and I make the assertion here that the woollen and cotton staples, mostly used by our people as clothing, are, taking quality and price together, as reasonable in price as they are in any country in the world. Taking quality and price together, these goods, which are really serviceable for wear—not clayed cotton, not shoddy woollens or tweeds or the like—but, taking them for wear and quality and price, you will get them in Canada equal to any country in the world. Taking all things into consideration, the farmer pays the minimum of taxation; and I say to you that there is no country in the world where the farmer pays less taxation than he does in this country upon all those staple articles which go into the consumption of his daily life.

REVENUE AND TAXATION.

We must look out as well for these gentlemen when they talk of the load of taxation. Taxation in this country is of different kinds. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that \$36,000,000 is what we write in taxes from the pockets of the poor people of Canada. What a fraud that is as an argument—calling that taxation and making the people, who know no better in some cases because they are not learned in figures, believe that a straight tax of \$36,000,000 is taken out of them. That statement is not true. Of that amount \$10,000,000 is for liquors and tobacco, and no man would get up in this House or any other Anglo-Saxon House of Parliament and

ask that these articles should be made free. So long as a revenue is needed, a revenue will be raised upon them. They are not necessities, but luxuries, and the man who buys them buys them with the knowledge that he is paying into the revenue, and when he does, it is a voluntary and not an involuntary tax. Then there are \$8,500,000 of earnings in this country. Are you taxed when you put a letter in the post office box with a three-cent stamp on it, and get some person to carry it 5,000 miles for you? I think not; I think you are getting your service done, and paying very cheaply for it. Are you taxed when you buy your ticket and get on a railway, and are whirled from Lewis to Halifax or St. John? I think not, for you get the cheapest travelling on the Intercolonial Railway that you can get anywhere. All that goes into these earnings. It is not taxation, but payment for a cheap service and a good service as well. Add these together and there are \$18,000,000. Add also the acknowledged luxuries, \$2,500,000, and you have \$20,000,000 of this which is not necessary taxation at all, which is either perfectly voluntary, or simply a cheap payment for good service. Now, that should be told. I hold that he is not a friend of his country, that he is an enemy of his country, who will, by keeping the truth from the people, raise discontent in the minds of the people—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER—and, if there is any man in this House that ought to say "hear, hear" when I mention that, it is the hon. gentleman who sits opposite me, the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). For, if there is any man in this House who has roused so much discontent and has driven so many people out of the country as the hon. member for South Oxford has by those ingenious diatribes of his, I should like to know who he is. But, Sir, my hon. friend has a brand new gospel; he brought it out to-night. He is going to have a new order of things, a political millennium—all to himself, I am afraid. What does he say? The leader of a party, speaking in Opposition, rises in his place and in a loud voice and in a tone that can be heard from Cape Breton to British Columbia, proclaims the new evangel. What is it? "Taxation is an evil which never produces prosperity; it is an abridgment of every good citizen's rights." Now, my hon. friend's duty is plain. He is the leader of a powerful party. Sometime in the by and by, may be the long by and by, he may get into power. But I want to impress this upon him, that when he gets into power he must practice the doctrine he preaches, and govern this country without placing upon the people, if he is true to his gospel, this evil which he declares never produced prosperity and which is an abridgment of every good citizen's rights. Sir, that doctrine in a leader

of the Government would be arrant foolishness, but in the mouth of an irresponsible leader of an Opposition it is a firebrand. It is a doctrine by which he hopes to win the favour of people who know less about it than he does by inspiring them with the hope that when the Hon. Wilfred Laurier rules this country there will be no taxation at all, none of this evil, "which never produced prosperity and which is an abridgment of every good citizen's rights." Now, does my hon. friend seriously believe what he says, or does he speak on the spur of the moment—in a moment of weakness, perhaps?

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not have them on this side.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, if my hon. friend will keep his wind-mills quiet—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) One is enough.

Mr. FOSTER. One at a time. Well, Sir, my hon. friend when he emitted that aphorism, that wise saying must have been undergoing a peculiar process of absorption from my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), because my hon. friend from South Oxford, not once or twice or two hundred times, but two thousand times, has declared in this House and in the country that we cannot create prosperity by means of taxation. Why, he said the other night that the Minister of Finance might as well get up on a steeple and jump off and then try to hold himself up by his boot strap as to try to induce prosperity by means of taxation. Well, the Minister of Finance has too much regard for his own life to try such acrobatic feats as that, but that trick would not be a whit more absurd than the doctrine my hon. friend has announced. Suppose we go down to Nova Scotia, to the Basin of Minas, and see the muddy waters of the basin when the tide is in and notice afterwards, when the tide is out, the portion of land from which the water has retreated and which is covered with the stratum of fertilizing soil left there by the outgoing water. Suppose a municipality there says: Why, this is very valuable, or might be made so. Here is a tract of one thousand acres of land no one of us is able to reclaim it; but as a municipality we will raise a sum of money by taxing ourselves and we will build a dyke that will inclose this thousand acre tract. They do that; they pay the taxes for one year, for two years, for three years, for five years; they raise the money; they expend it; they battle with the waves; they make the dykes, and you go down there a year or two afterwards and see a thousand acres of the best soil in the world, with its waving grass that brings a perennial income over and above the taxes imposed to pay for this improvement. Yet my hon. friend says that taxation is an evil and an abridgment of every good citizen's rights, that you can never create prosperity by taxation. Maybe you cannot create pros-

perity or we bring the national the national values which they have done without state, with even west was not incognita to us buying it from and did buy it taxed the people have told us: means of taxation to buy the North their taxation But the thousand fertile land which open to the sun golden crown of ing refutation can produce w But my hon. fr taxation; freed hon. friend say reforming the kind attempt it, that dare not touch men opposite so that is, that the tween a principle, that there tree and the tw hon. friend was out into the or fruit tree, and see some golden notice here a br to use a word w late. He would out from a part not be allowed a branch deform friend is the kind went into the ore kind would prom and cut the tree a good husband do that sort of t man would look a tree; a good tru some moulderin that should not be a sharp knife and mities and would tiful and capable This husbandman the fruits of his s who would act be cast by the o and condemned e doleful wallings e monly called in th

UNRESTRICTED R
TION

My hon. friend they ever propo the Canadian

perity or wealth by it, but you certainly bring the unused wealth, you certainly bring the national resources, formerly comparatively valueless, into a state or condition in which they yield revenue, which could not be done without taxation. So it is with every state, with every country. When the North-west was not known; when it was a terra incognita to us, and we conceived the idea of buying it from the Hudson's Bay Company, and did buy it, and paid our \$1,600,000 and taxed the people for it, my hon. friend would have told us: You cannot produce wealth by means of taxation. But we paid the taxation to buy the North-west and by means of further taxation we opened it for settlement. But the thousands and millions of acres of fertile land which now and in the future lie open to the sunlight and the breeze with their golden crown of waving grain, will be a standing refutation of the theory that you never can produce wealth by means of taxation. But my hon. friend is not going to have any taxation; freedom, he says, is the goal. My hon. friend says that we must not talk of reforming the tariff, that it is idle for me to attempt it, that I dare not attempt it, that I dare not touch the principle. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to forget one thing, and that is, that there is a line of distinction between a principle and a detail of that principle, that there is a distinction between the tree and the twig on the tree. Suppose my hon. friend was a husbandman. He would go out into the orchard and find a beautiful fruit tree, and as he went up to it, would see some golden fruit upon it. But he would notice here a branch which was mouldering, to use a word which has come into vogue of late. He would find a sucker growth coming out from a part of the tree where it should not be allowed to grow. He would find a branch deformed and gnarly. My hon. friend is the kind of husbandman, who, if he went into the orchard and saw a tree of that kind would promptly take his little hatchet and cut the tree down. My hon. friend is not a good husbandman, consequently he would do that sort of thing, but the real husbandman would look at that tree and say: A fine tree; a good trunk and fair branches; still some mouldering branches and some growth that should not be there. And he would take a sharp knife and carefully cut off the deformities and would leave the tree more beautiful and capable of producing more fruit. This husbandman would enjoy thereafter the fruits of his skill, while the husbandman who would act as my hon. friend, would be cast by the owner into outer darkness, and condemned ever after to listen to the doleful wallings of a party who are commonly called in this country, Grits.

UNRESTRICTED RECIPROCITY AND ASSIMILATION OF TARIFFS.

My hon. friend says that it is false that they ever proposed an assimilation of the Canadian tariff to the United

States tariff. Well, my hon. friend has a short memory. If I were to treat this argument with him as he treated the \$1.50-a-bushel-of-wheat argument I would convict him of insincerity at once; and I am not sure that I could not bring it very close home to him if I had here the notes and the speeches that have been made. I will, however, admit this, that my hon. friend had sense enough to know from the first that that was the weak point, and the rock upon which the whole scheme would split, and he was very wary of speaking of it, or coming within touch of it. But my hon. friend cannot have read the American press, he cannot have read the utterances of American statesmen, if he does not know that almost without exception the press and statesmen of the United States have declared that any scheme of unrestricted reciprocity between this country and the United States, is impossible, except upon an assimilation of the tariffs of the two countries. I can give authority after authority, by the hour, for that statement. Everybody knows it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Produce one now.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to weary this House or insult its good sense by producing it; but if my hon. friend has a thirst for information, I will give him my book tomorrow, and he can read for an hour the opinions of the American statesmen and American newspapers in that direction, and in that direction alone.

Mr. CHARLTON. You ought to have come here prepared to verify your statements.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir, I will have something to do with that hon. gentleman before I get through. My hon. friend says that no Liberal has said so, that no United States adherent has said so. I have made my assertion with reference to that, and I invite him to examine the records to see whether it be not true. Well, my hon. friend was not satisfied to leave well enough alone. If he had left that point with the simple assertion that no Liberal had said that they would assimilate the tariffs, that no adherent of the United States had said so, it might have gone on the strength of his word. But my hon. friend went into the dangerous course for him of undertaking to reason, and the further he reasoned, the more effectually he destroyed his own contention. My hon. friend said—and there he touched the weak point at once—that if there was a little lower tariff in one country than in the other, the tendency would be to import goods from the country which had the lowest tariff and smuggle them into the country which had the higher tariff. Then my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), who so valiantly denied the assimilation of tariff the other night, is on record as saying that it must be so, and that the United States people are not such arrant fools

as to submit to a scheme of reciprocity in which there is not an assimilation of tariffs. My hon. friend has stated the weak point, and I invited him, as I have invited them again and again, to show to this House how they are going to arrange unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and discrimination against other countries, without an assimilation of tariffs. The hon. gentleman cannot do it, and there is not a level-headed man in the United States who has expressed himself on this subject, who is not in disagreement with him on that point. Well, Sir, my hon. friend has one strong adherent, a man of whom not much has been heard in United States politics, a Mr. Campbell, of Ohio. My hon. friend declared that Mr. Campbell was a host, and that Mr. Campbell had declared himself in favour of reciprocity; and he brought out a sheet of paper with a very long extract upon it, which he read to the House as Mr. Campbell's offer of reciprocity. What was it? It was an agreement between two foolish young people named Maude and Claude that they would kiss each other. Now, does my hon. friend know not that he is trifling with the question and trifling with this House when he declares that the Democratic party is going to give us, and is willing to give us, a reciprocity treaty upon the ground of a simple story told by Mr. Campbell with reference to Maude and Claude? My hon. friend has declared that the Democratic victory in the United States has been a victory for the freedom of the trade to this extent, that it is going to do away with all tariff for protection, and introduce a tariff for revenue alone. My hon. friend declared in the same breath that in Canada he was going to do away with all protection, and introduce a tariff for revenue. Now, when the United States gets down to a simple revenue basis, and my hon. friend gets Canada down to a simple revenue basis, where will be his basis for reciprocity between the two countries?

LEADS TO ANNEXATION.

My hon. friend says that unrestricted reciprocity does not lead to annexation. He knew that a trusted leader of his had declared himself in a different direction, and so he read to fortify himself a few words of what Mr. Blake said on one side, and a little more of what Mr. Blake said on the other. Mr. Blake's evidence is strong evidence whenever it can be quoted against my hon. friend, because in heart he was with the other side, their trusted leader for many a year; and when he was their leader every man of them fell down on his knees and worshipped the superior ability and acumen of Mr. Blake. If Mr. Blake, the trusted leader of the party had so to wrench party affiliations and go against the course of a lifetime, as to break with that party, if Mr. Blake's familiar, and chosen, and hot duty, for years was to rake, with his strong shot, the

ranks of the Liberal-Conservative party, any bit of evidence that Mr. Blake gives against the Liberal-Conservative party is in the line of all his wishes, while every bit of evidence that he is forced to give against the party with which he was so long associated, is something wrenched from him unwillingly, and consequently of priceless value in comparison with the evidence given against the other side. Mr. Blake may have thought that the Conservative policy of protection would lead to annexation; but he declared in language that admits no doubt, that unrestricted reciprocity would certainly lead to annexation. He said:

I see no plan for combining the two elements of permanency of the treaty and variability of tariffs, which does not involve a practical control of the latter (tariff) by the United States.

The tendency in Canada of unrestricted free trade with the States, high duties being maintained against the United Kingdom would be towards political union.

Thus far my hon. friend read and then he stopped. But Mr. Blake went on to say:—

And the more successful the plan the stronger the tendency, both by reason of the community of interests, the intermingling of populations, the more intimate business and social connections and the trade and fiscal relations amounting to dependency, which it would create with the States; and of the greater isolation and divergency from Britain which it would produce; and also, and especially, through inconveniences experienced in the maintenance and apprehensions entertained as to the termination of the treaty.

Our hopes and our fears alike would draw one way. We would then indeed be "looking to Washington."

The treaty once made the vantage ground it gave would naturally be used for the accomplishment of its ulterior purpose; and this political end would be a great factor in the consideration by the States of Canadian views upon changes in the joint tariff, or as to the maintenance or termination of the treaty.

The reorganization to which our neighbours look is, of course, the unification of the continent.

That is Mr. Blake's opinion with reference to the tendency of unrestricted reciprocity, and every sentence is an irresistible argument in that way. Mr. Blake went on to say:

Without assured permanence some Conservative predictions of evil, else fallacious, would come true; for our undeniable natural advantages in raw materials, labour, situation and facilities would be unnaturally handicapped.

No manufacturer, looking to the continental market, would fix or even enlarge his capital or business in the country of five millions at the risk of being cut off from the country of sixty-five millions.

Our neighbours, instead of engaging in manufactures here would take our markets with goods manufactured there.

And our raw materials, instead of being finished on the ground, would be exported to be finished abroad.

That is Mr. Blake's opinion, the opinion of a trusted leader of their own, a man who, because his party had taken up the fad of unrestricted reciprocity, was wrenched from his allegiance to that party, and obliged to give reluctant testimony, albeit strong testimony, against the fad and policy which they had adopted.

DISC

But my hon. friend's objection of all to a city plan is discrimination must have had the assurance of the hon. member (Mr. Charleton) and the hon. member (Mr. Davies) and based on discrimination would be. Upon the George Brown Treaty, was negotiated in 1874. Those three have the other, have tried an idea which is a thing can be, namely, discriminated against too, with the consent of the British Government, with knowing it is a them with is, that that it is false, declare the assertion that either intended or possible. Treaty, I stake my man in this country, stand by my statement, gentleman have either have misrepresented, ask the attention of prove it. Sir, it is a variety of circumstances going to take the chance find that the treaty 1874; George Brown was stated it; Alexander Premier of this country himself signed the measure the nature of the reciprocity which were to be followed. What does he say? Other provisions, he says

In the matter of reciprocity itself, there is no reason to derive very great advantages from a list of articles named in a treaty, such as follows:—agricultural implements, salt, building, bath-bricks, calamine, manufactured articles not from England, ochres, ground

That was on 9th March which was to guide George Brown's pressly confined the list of articles not produced in England. Let us go on to the second step will be of Council, approved on in which we find this States were pressing for wider than that suggested

Sir Edward Thornton's despatch to the Governor-General of a list of articles named in the list of articles named so as to embrace the articles of the two countries. The Governor

DISCRIMINATION.

But my hon. friend says that the strongest objection of all to the unrestricted reciprocity plan is discrimination. He admits that discrimination must be had, but he actually had the assurance to follow in the wake of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and base his argument that discrimination would be allowed—upon what? Upon the George Brown draft treaty, which, in 1874, was negotiated by him at Washington. Those three hon. gentlemen, one after the other, have tried to give currency to an idea which is as false in fact as any thing can be, namely, that the draft of 1874 discriminated against Great Britain and that, too, with the consent and approbation of the British Government. I do not charge them with knowing it is false. What I charge them with is, that they who ought to know that it is false, declare that it is true, and on the assertion that no discrimination was either intended or permitted in that Draft Treaty, I stake my reputation as a public man in this country, and I am willing to stand by my statement, and those three gentlemen have either misunderstood or have misrepresented the whole thing. I ask the attention of this House while I prove it. Sir, it can be proved from a variety of circumstances; I am simply going to take the chain as I find it. I find that the treaty was negotiated in 1874; George Brown was the man who negotiated it; Alexander Mackenzie was the Premier of this country at the time. He himself signed the memorandum, outlining the nature of the reciprocity negotiations which were to be followed by George Brown. What does he say? After going over the other provisions, he says:

In the matter of reciprocal trade considered by itself, there is no reason to doubt that Canada would derive very great advantages from an extension of the list of articles named in article 3 of the former treaty, such as follows:—Manufactures in wood, agricultural implements, salt, mineral oils, bricks for building, bath-bricks, calcined plaster, burnt lime, manufactured articles not produced in or exported from England, ochres, ground or unground.

That was on 9th March in the memorandum which was to guide George Brown, and it expressly confined the list to manufactured articles not produced in or exported from England. Let us go on to the second step. The second step will be found in the Minute of Council, approved on 26th March, 1874, in which we find this passage—it must be remembered that at his time the United States were pressing for a manufactured list wider than that suggested:

Sir Edward Thornton's despatch to His Excellency the Governor-General of a late date, indicates a desire on the part of the United States to extend the list of articles named in the Treaty of 1854, so as to embrace the articles of the manufactures of the two countries. The Government of Canada will

be willing to agree to such reciprocity—to include manufactures in wood, such as sashes, doors, blinds, pails, tubs, barrels, matches and various other articles of a like nature—agricultural implements, bath-bricks, bricks for building purposes, calcined gypsum or plaster lime, earth ochres, ground or unground, and generally, all manufactured articles not produced in or exported from Great Britain to this country, together with such other articles as the Imperial and Dominion Governments may mutually agree upon, or as may by mutual arrangement be entered at a fixed duty to be specified in the treaty. It is, however, understood that no proposition affecting the introduction of manufactured goods shall be finally determined upon prior to reference to the Imperial and Dominion Governments. As a natural production, salt may be added to the former free list.

The same careful desire was extended at this second stage of the proceedings to exclude articles in regard to which a discrimination was likely to occur in respect to Great Britain, and every precaution was taken afterwards that if this article were extended, it should only be after reference to the two Governments. The Order in Council goes on to say:

Mr. Brown will communicate this view to Sir Edward Thornton, accompanied with the representation that the Government of Canada do not propose any modification in matter of trade and commerce which would in any way injuriously affect Imperial interests.

That is another stage. On 23rd April, 1874, Earl Carnarvon signs a despatch to Earl Dufferin, in which he says:

After consultation with this department, Lord Derby sent a telegram to Sir E. Thornton, informing him that the proposed paper might be submitted to Mr. Fish, but that the proposals should not be made as being the result of the matured decision of Her Majesty's Government, but as preliminary only, and Sir E. Thornton was desired to explain this to Mr. Fish.

Further, this shows the spirit of the instructions, the actual instructions, the prudent care taken that those instructions should not be exceeded, the spirit of the instructions being that there should be no discrimination against Great Britain. That is one set of facts. Now, Sir, I wish to adduce another proof. I suppose the treaty itself may be taken as showing what the treaty means. I challenged my hon. friend the other day to read a single clause of that treaty which made it a condition of the treaty that the articles which were admitted free from the United States into Canada should not be admitted free to Great Britain or any other country. He could not read it, he cannot read it, because it is not in the treaty. But he attempted to make this argument, that although it was not in the treaty, yet it is common sense to believe that if they had made a treaty between each other, whereby certain articles were to come free into each country, with no other word or sentence qualifying it, that necessarily it must be confined to those two countries. The opposite is the exact truth. But I desire to carry the argu-

ment further. There is another article in the treaty which provides for a most-favoured nation treatment. Why do they insert most-favoured nation treatment, if the treaty itself gave the United States a preferential market, with a discrimination against Great Britain in regard to the articles mentioned, and which are set out in another article, which hon. gentlemen can read, and which I will not trouble the House by reading? It is an article providing that, if any more favourable considerations are given by the United States to a third country, or by Canada to any third country, the same shall be given by one country to the other.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman read the paragraph which he says provides a more-favoured nation clause with respect to articles named in the treaty?

Mr. FOSTER. I will read the clause, which is as follows:—

For the term mentioned in Article XIII no other or higher duty shall be imposed in the United States upon other articles not enumerated in said schedules, growth, produce or manufacture of Canada; or in Canada upon such other articles the growth, produce or manufacture of the United States, than are respectively imposed upon like articles the growth, produce or manufacture of Great Britain or of any other country.

These two articles go together. The first one is explicit in saying that the two countries shall exchange certain products, and there is no article in the treaty which says there shall be a preferential treatment given to each other. And then the commerce between the two countries is extended on the same amicable line to articles which were not mentioned therein to provide for most favoured nation, but not preferential, terms to either one or the other. Now, Sir, my contention, so far, is this: That the spirit of the instructions all the way through was to prevent discrimination against Britain, and that, when a treaty is made, the treaty makes no mention of discrimination against Great Britain. Then I come to George Brown's testimony. George Brown ought to know as much about it as any other man. George Brown made that speech after all the schedules had been submitted, after the treaty had been completed as far as it was completed, and with full knowledge of the articles in the schedule, which he read in his speech only two minutes before. George Brown read the very schedule that my hon. friend read to-night, and then, after reading that, he expressed himself in this way, as to certain objections urged against the treaty.

The first of these objections which he referred to was that the treaty discriminated against Great Britain, and in favour of the United States.

He declared this objection to be unfounded, and proved it by saying:

It was perfectly understood from the opening negotiations that no article could be free from duty in regard to the United States, which was not also free with regard to Great Britain, and nothing else was ever contemplated for a moment.

Now, Sir, if George Brown had said that, after the first schedules had been handed in, there might have been some ground for the argument of the hon. gentleman; that he spoke about a subject that he was but half through with in the negotiations. But George Brown made the statement after the draft treaty had been concluded, and after he had just read to the Senate the very schedule of manufactured goods which my hon. friend read, and George Brown distinctly states that it was never contemplated for a moment, and that actually no discrimination was allowed in that treaty against Great Britain. My hon. friend thought that he had lighted upon an argument which helped him out, and he read the report of the Board of Trade upon this draft treaty which had been submitted to it by Lord Derby. Lord Derby, who knew the whole tenor and spirit of all the negotiations, knew that assurances had been given to him by the Canadian Government that no discrimination should be allowed against Great Britain, and knew that every step in the work of that treaty-making had been under the direct supervision of that Imperial Government. The board of trade reported what? They reported that they found nothing against the treaty, as it was submitted. They did not mention discrimination. My hon. friend put that in as an aside afterwards, as though they had that in their minds, but the board of trade made that report upon the data of the schedules before them, and the promise that these articles mentioned in the schedules should be free to Great Britain as well as to Canada. But, Sir, if George Brown did not know anything about it, and if my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition thinks he can asperse the character and veracity of the Hon. George Brown, who made as positive a statement as a man could make, and made it with all the knowledge of the facts; perhaps my hon. friend will allow that Lord Derby ought to know something about it. Well, Sir, at that very time, almost at that very moment, there was a fear in England that this treaty as regards this schedule was going to discriminate against Great Britain, and representatives of various trades headed a deputation to Lord Derby and waited on him, and expressed their fears, and implored his intervention in the matter, and what did Lord Derby say?

It was the bounden duty of Her Majesty's Government to insist that British free trade should not be placed at a disadvantage as compared with other countries, in any treaty which might be entered into on behalf of the colonies; also to forbid the imposition of differential duties in favour of the United States against Great Britain in any such treaty.

And he further assured the deputation:

That there was no warrant the conclusion were in favour of

Mr. LAURIER

Mr. FOSTER

Mr. LAURIER

Mr. FOSTER month,

Mr. DAVIES

Mr. FOSTER

the date more in of what is said

Mr. DAVIES important to know

statement before the schedule to the board of trade

discriminate if w Government would

Mr. FOSTER said that.

Mr. DAVIES (spatch following, board of trade su

he approved of th

Mr. FOSTER stated what my

now. My hon. f

out of a very sm

proposes to crawl because he cannot

hour, upon which Derby was made

its accuracy with What did Lord Der

deputation:

That there was noth warrant the conclusion were in favour of disc

He said, in addition

It was the bounden ment to insist that Brit

at a disadvantage, and of differential duties i

as against Great Britain

And yet my hon. fri

that by asking me the exact hour, and

the minute hand or pointed, when that

Well, as I have said b for such dense ignor

member for North stated the other day

discussing this quest and so also have

on the other side poor students as not

are poor political trust the interests

less of a country. quently threshed on know that the Hon

time and again gave

That there was nothing in the proposed treaty to warrant the conclusion that the Canadian Government were in favour of such a discrimination.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the date?

Mr. FOSTER. 1874.

Mr. LAURIER. What month?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give you the month.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is important.

Mr. FOSTER. It is important. But, is the date more important than the substance of what is said?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, because it is important to know whether he made that statement before he referred the treaty with the schedule to the board of trade, and got the board of trade's answer that we could discriminate if we pleased, and the English Government would say nothing against it.

Mr. FOSTER. The board of trade never said that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And then his despatch following, in which he said, with the board of trade statement in his hand, that he approved of the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. The board of trade never stated what my hon. friend asserted just now. My hon. friend is satisfied to crawl out of a very small hole, and the hole he proposes to crawl out of to-night is this: that because he cannot have the exact date and hour, upon which this utterance of Lord Derby was made, therefore, he impugns its accuracy with reference to this treaty. What did Lord Derby say? He assured the deputation:

That there was nothing in the proposed treaty to warrant the conclusion that the Canadian Government were in favour of discrimination.

He said, in addition, that:

It was the bounden duty of Her Majesty's Government to insist that British trade should not be placed at a disadvantage, and also to forbid the imposition of differential duties in favour of the United States as against Great Britain in any such treaty.

And yet my hon. friend tries to get out of all that by asking me for the exact second in the exact hour, and the exact dot to which the minute hand or second hand of the clock pointed, when that statement was made. Well, as I have said before, there is no excuse for such dense ignorance in this matter. The member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated the other day that he had been discussing this question for fifteen years, and so also have other hon. gentlemen on the other side. If they are such poor students as not to know the facts, they are poor political leaders to whom to trust the interests of a party still less of a country. This has been frequently threshed out in the papers. We know that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie time and again gave the same assurance, and

the Toronto "Mail," in discussing this matter, said:

We are authorized by the Hon. Alex. McKenzie to state that Mr. McDougall is entirely mistaken in stating that discrimination was suggested or proposed or permitted under the treaty of 1874.

Sir, I have done with that, after having made the argument, I again make the assertion: That no discrimination was intended or was made in that treaty. If my hon. friend has nothing better by which to recommend to the people the adoption of a scheme against which he declares discrimination to be the chief factor of objection, than a baseless assertion like this, his case is lost, and he need not go to the country upon it. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) made his statement the other night equally without foundation, in order to prove that discrimination on another occasion had been proposed. He declared that Sir John Macdonald, the political godfather of the Liberal-Conservative party, had sent Sir Alexander Galt, and three others, in 1865, down to Washington, and through them had offered to assimilate the Customs tariffs of the two countries, which he contended was parallel in principle and in details to what he and his friends propose to do under unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. gentleman made that statement along with the others, and it shows an equal lack of investigation and an equal lack of accuracy. I have before me exactly what was proposed, in a minute made in memorandum by Sir Alexander Galt and his confrères. It was when they were trying to have the treaty of 1854 extended, or something else put in its place. They went down, and they found the temper of the people at Washington against renewing the old reciprocity treaty. One of the strongest objections urged against its renewal was this: That, owing to peculiar internal taxes in the United States, the Americans insisted on a larger impost upon the articles which had formerly been in the treaty list in order to equalize the exchange between the two countries; and the proposition made by Sir Alexander Galt, and his confrères, was this:

The trade between the United States and the British provinces should, it is believed, under ordinary circumstances, be free in reference to their natural productions; but as internal taxes exceptionally exist in the United States, it is now proposed that the articles embraced in the free list of the reciprocity treaty should continue to be exchanged, subject only to such duties as may be equivalent to that internal taxation. It is suggested that both parties may add certain articles to those now in the said list.

If the foregoing points be satisfactorily arranged, Canada is willing to adjust her excise duties upon spirits, beer and tobacco, upon the best revenue standard which may be mutually adopted after full consideration of the subject; and if it be desired to treat any other articles in the same way, the disposition of the Canadian Government is to give every facility in their power to prevent illicit trade.

Memorandum "B" was given as an answer by the United States delegates. They

give a list of the articles in the treaty of 1854, and upon all of them they put less or greater duties, which they desired Canada to pay in order to compensate for the disadvantage they claimed to be under on account of their internal taxation. In memorandum "G" which followed, Mr. Galt replied :

In reference to the memorandum received from the Committee on Ways and Means, the provincial delegates regret to be obliged to state that the proposals therein contained in regard to the commercial relations between the two countries are not such as they can recommend for the adoption of the respective legislatures. The imposts which it is proposed to lay upon the productions of the British provinces on their entry into the markets of the United States, are such as, in their opinion, will be in some cases prohibitory, and will certainly seriously interfere with the natural course of trade. These imposts are so much beyond what the delegates conceive to be an equivalent for the internal taxation of the United States, that they are reluctantly brought to the conclusion that they cannot assent to the proposed trade between the two countries to be carried on upon the principles of reciprocity. With the concurrence of the British Minister at Washington, they are therefore obliged respectfully to decline to enter into the engagement suggested in the memorandum.

That is all there is to that. It affords not the shadow of an argument in favour of discrimination, or in favour of assimilation of tariffs between the two countries. Now, Sir, I have exhausted my own patience, and I suppose the patience of the House, and yet there are two or three points which I feel I must touch upon.

MR. CHARLTON'S ASSERTIONS.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated, the other day, that the Government had asserted, when they went to the people in 1891, that they would certainly get a reciprocity treaty from the United States, and that on that assertion, which he declared had no foundation in fact, we had fooled and deceived the people, and gained the election. I am anxious for honest and fair debate in this House, and in my anxiety for it I gave my hon. friend a chance to retract the strength of that assertion, and I supposed he would like a man, say: Well, that was a little too strong; you did not actually assert that, but you left it to be implied. But my hon. friend would not take advantage of that opportunity, and not once, but twice or three times before he finished his speech, he declared that we had actually asserted that we would be certain to get a reciprocity treaty, and that we had carried the country on that cry. Now, I give my hon. friend another opportunity to retract that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. He will not do it. I am not surprised at that; but what does surprise me is that hon. gentlemen who sit beside him on the front benches will stand by him in his refusal to retract a statement

which he did not prove and which he cannot prove. When he was asked to produce his authority, what did he quote? He quoted the Toronto "Empire." The Toronto "Empire" is not the Government. He had not stated that the Toronto "Empire" had declared thus and so. He had said that the Government had actually said so and so. But even when he read the extract from the Toronto "Empire," it appeared that the Toronto "Empire" did not say it; and he actually struggled through the whole extract without showing one single syllable of line which could bear out the assertion that he made. The hon. gentleman went on, afterwards, to declare that the draft treaty of 1874 was an actual and square discrimination on all fours with what was proposed under unrestricted reciprocity. Sir John Thompson gave him an opportunity to take that back. He asked a certain question as to whether the Hon. George Brown had made a statement, by way of denial. But the hon. gentleman never answers a question squarely. He did not answer that; but he went off on a side shift. Now, Sir, there are two examples of an hon. gentleman choosing to argue against his opponents by actually falsifying the record, and when he was given an opportunity of putting himself right, utterly declining to put himself right. And he not only stated that in the face of members in this House who could judge of its falsity, but his speech goes out to the world, and it will be by and by, I suppose, printed in pamphlet form, as are all his speeches, and be sent out to a larger constituency, and men will read, and men will say the Canadian Government is a bad Government. Why? Because they declared in 1891, that they were certain to get a reciprocity treaty, they went to the people on this declaration and they did not get it; because they declared against discrimination and that the British Government is against discrimination, and yet, in 1874, discrimination was actually allowed and acceded to by Great Britain. And men will say, we cannot support a Government which can be guilty of such deceit as that. And when asked, why do you come to that conclusion, they will answer: Because Honest John Charlton said so, because Mr. Charlton is a Christian, because he is an elder of the Presbyterian Church, because he is a stickler for the Sabbath, because he is a man who pretends to great goodness, and is truly good, and John Charlton would not say this unless it were so. We will base our political action on what John Charlton says, because we believe in his honesty, I must say that that is a propaganda which ought not to be carried on—not as between parties, for I am not speaking now merely of parties—but as between the man and the people who read what the man says. My hon. friend is very much against the captain of a tug taking hold of a little string, and allowing the shrill whistle of his tug to rend the

solemn stillness
I would rather than
stillness of the S
tug blow its horn
would offend a
which society
tained—truth betw
Sir, if that captai
his mate, the min
done. He would
his own heart, he
confidence of his
would be the only
is to be said of a p
these utterances
foundation, and w
to take them back
not do it, but will s
broad and wide thr
is not the kind of
to obtain

MR. DAVIES AND

The hon. gentle
my friend from
(Mr. Davies) erred
bound to say through
man, especially one
leader of the Mar
err. My hon. fri
Davies) learned to
and in that melod
so well known, c
ence, whether the
It or not, delibe
falsifying the rec
of one of those in
wound up, cannot
runs down and the
which makes a
greater speed than a
My hon. friend comm
wound up, by saying
so, but I do not acc
fully, as you had a
your own mind whic
ment, and therefore
quite correct. But be
he put it in plain l
that the Minister of E
falsified the record.
My friend talks of record
had in his hands a
where? To the Ameri
the document? A let
Blaine. My hon. frie
statement made a ye
the authority of a M
of the two-fellow M
Washington—a state
fuller than that mad
those to ignore that ev
other as the sole record
Does it make any intri
I made my statement
room and presented it
or whether I stated it

solemn stillness of the Sabbath morning. I would rather that he would rend the solemn stillness of the Sabbath morn, by letting the tug blow its horn 10,000 times, than that he would offend against the compact upon which society can alone be maintained—truth between man and man; and yet, Sir, if that captain of the tug told a lie to his mate, the minimum of wrong would be done. He would have sullied the purity of his own heart, he would have outraged the confidence of his neighbour; but these two would be the only ones concerned. But what is to be said of a public man who would make these utterances without any shadow of foundation, and who, when given a chance to take them back and set himself right, will not do it, but will spread them as propaganda broad and wide throughout the country. That is not the kind of political warfare that ought to obtain:

MR. DAVIES AND THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE.

The hon. gentleman sitting near me, my friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) erred in the same way, I am bound to say through ignorance, as no public man, especially one who proposes to be the leader of the Maritime provinces, ought to err. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) leaned towards me as he spoke; and in that melodramatic manner of his, so well known, always full of vehemence, whether there is anything behind it or not, deliberately accused me of falsifying the record. He reminds me of one of those instruments which, when wound up, cannot be stopped until it runs down and the last clanging note of which makes a greater noise and at greater speed than any preceding revolution. My hon. friend commenced, just after he was wound up, by saying: you said what was not so, but I do not accuse you of doing it willfully, as you had a certain bias naturally in your own mind which came out in your statement, and, therefore, your statement is not quite correct. But before he got to the last he put it in plain language, and declared that the Minister of Finance had deliberately falsified the record. What record? My hon. friend talks of records. What records? He had in his hands a document. Presented where? To the American Senate. What was the document? A letter. From whom? Mr. Blaine. My hon. friend had before him the statement made a year ago in this House, on the authority of a Minister, in the presence of the two-fellow Ministers who went to Washington—a statement which is longer and fuller than that made by Mr. Blaine. He chose to ignore that evidence and to take the other as the sole record and the sole evidence. Does it make any intrinsic difference whether I made my statement in the privacy of my room and presented it in writing to the House, or whether I stated it in the Budget speech,

as my report, made here as a responsible Minister of the Crown, weighing my words and making my statement, as I believed it to be true? What fairness was there in taking Mr. Blaine's letter as the only record, as if my statement were not equally a matter of record? The hon. gentleman in his speech said that Mr. Blaine in his letter included every single thing that took place. How did he know? He does not know. All the probabilities are against Mr. Blaine having written in that letter a record of every thing that took place. As a matter of fact, he did not write one-fifth part of what took place. He recorded no protocols; there were none. He simply placed a letter in the hands of the President, giving in a few sentences his recollection of the conference as bearing on the request of Congress and of what he should report. That was a record, and mine is equally a record, and a fuller and longer one than that. It is reserved for a Canadian, and a person in Opposition, to declare the statement of a Canadian co-member false, and take without question the statement of Mr. Blaine!

Mr. CHARLTON. Do we understand the hon. gentleman to assert that the statement made by Mr. Blaine is false?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has risen in a very stately way and has intoned in a very grave voice, but he is altogether ahead of the record. If he will sit still, I will tell him.

Mr. CHARLTON. Say yes or no.

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place, I think the House will take it for granted that my hon. friend is wrong in saying that Blaine's letter detailed everything that took place. Does he still hold to that assertion? Again let me ask my hon. friend if he did not say that I probably might be a little misled from bias in my own direction. Am I alone human, and was Mr. Blaine alone superior to human frailty? Was there no humanity and bias in the Secretary of the United States, which might incline him to give a report in the line of his own wishes? Honestly and fairly, was he not as liable thereto as myself, and yet his statement is taken as a strictly unbiassed report and mine a falsification of the record, unworthy of credence. Now, my hon. friend put a question to me a little while ago, which I will answer, for he (Mr. Davies) said—I can read his words if he doubts me—that the Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, emphatically denied Mr. Foster's statement. Will my hon. friend point out one sentence of Mr. Blaine's which denies one single statement made by me? Put the two records side by side. I say more than Mr. Blaine did; Mr. Blaine says less than I did. I said everything that Mr. Blaine said—I do not mean just in exactly the

same language, but I treated every one of the points he treated—but he did not treat all of the points that I did. Mr. Blaine stated that the first proposal made was for reciprocity in natural products, with such extensions and qualifications as the altered circumstances required. I stated that; we agree in that point. Mr. Blaine stated that a list of manufactured articles was to be included along with that of natural products. I stated that the line must be in natural products and manufactures generally. There is a divergence, but that is all. Mr. Blaine stated that there must be discrimination against Great Britain; I stated there must be discrimination against Great Britain. In all these particulars we are exactly alike or we are very close together. For, the rest, I make statements and deal with subjects which Mr. Blaine does not touch, but which were discussed in the conference that took place, and discussed for some considerable time. Now, I ask my hon. friend, whether he has been quite fair to me in representing Mr. Blaine as having recorded all that took place, as giving the only record that should be relied upon, and refusing to take my statement as a record of the case, in refusing to look upon my statement as worthy of credence, at least, equally with that of Mr. Blaine. At least he should give me the credit that he felt disposed to give in the first part of his address, when he said that I had not wilfully misrepresented. I know that when the hon. gentleman reads what he has said and thinks over the matter, he will feel that he has been unfair to me in that respect, as no man should be to his fellow member, sitting opposite to him in the House of Commons, where all men are supposed to be gentlemen. Now, Sir, I have not one word or one syllable to retract of the statement I made last year on that point. I stand by it; I stand by it entirely; I stand by it without any mental reservation; I stand by it in the presence of my colleagues who were there with me. And I ask this House to judge of the sense of fairness of that hon. gentleman who can find the only authoritative statement on the part of the stranger and refuse all credence or credit for honesty to his fellow citizen and his fellow member.

WHAT THE OPPOSITION WANT.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a word or two in closing, with reference to the general subject. I find that I have been kept close to the points which have been made to-night or recently, and that I have not touched the general points which I had hoped to deal with, which were made during the debate. I close with this simple thought, and I ask the attention of my fellow members on this side of the House, and I ask the attention of the country as well. These hon. gentlemen may not be very well agreed as to what they want, but they are perfectly agreed as to what they are against. When you come to sum up the

expressions of the foremost men as to what they want there is a wide divergence of opinion among them. They agree as to their positive faith in very few principles, and in other respects there is a wide divergence. The hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) believes in unrestricted reciprocity; he wants access to the United States markets, and believes that it is the only salvation for Canada in the line of development and permanent prosperity. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is determined to devote his life to getting unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is less definite and precise. He has found out that it is the best sometimes not to say too much or say it too positively, so this time he harks back considerably, and he sums up his policy in this wonderfully positive and definite form: "We desire the broadest treaty possible consistent with the commercial and political independence of Canada." The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had a little good humoured chaff with me because, he said, I was indefinite in my statement; but he capped the climax of indefiniteness. He declared: "I want the freest possible trade with the United States, consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries." He is much dissatisfied with me because I stated that I would do the best for the whole country. He determined to be very definite, and this is his definition. I can see my hon. friend going from this House and meeting a farmer, one of those depressed farmers of whom he speaks, and the farmer says: Mr. Paterson, you are just down from the Legislative halls. I know you are a very learned man, and a very famous politician; I know your keenness of vision and your breadth of comprehension. I want to know whether you are going to get me the market of the United States? And the hon. gentleman will satisfy the burning thirst of that poor, depressed farmer by saying: All I can tell you is that I want the freest possible trade with the United States consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries. Then he will meet one of those prosperous manufacturers of his own town, who will come to him with anxiety in his face, and say: Now, Mr. Paterson, what is to be the end of this matter; are we going to have reciprocity, and if we have it, as you say we must, are we to be mercilessly exposed to competition with the United States? And the good member will draw himself up to his full height and say: I cannot tell you whether it will be that way or not; but I can tell you my faith and creed—I want the freest possible trade with the United States consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries. And so he will satisfy every one of his constituents with that most definite and positive statement and, if in his town they do not put up a monument sacred to the great N. P., I am sure they will put up a monument sacred to the positive clearness

and definite concept. The member for the most conservative is not for revolution of the existing industry. He enue and would like could be elected in any of direct taxation. enue or annexation man no friend of Canada enue or annexation sitting very closely to has been talking indepe months. And the hon. (Mr. Tarte) has two pl is that legislation sho the profits of the farm

Mr. TARTE. I new thing of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. If m

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. FOSTER. No conversation with my friend will turn up the at the report of his s look at the manifesto t he gave to his county, statements in it, or French.

Mr. TARTE. Perhaps

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps I will leave it to him. said that he is going i as will raise the value ducts, and that Mr. Lat power, will leave two standing in the temple

Mr. TARTE. I never anything of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Then French. I will look that wrong I will withdraw That is what my hon. fri tive side.

WHAT THEY ARE

Now, I want to d of the House to what when they come to the there is no hesitation; definiteness. Their prop firm, and I want it to to the other of this coun propaganda? The hon. Oxford says:

Our policy from first to last this villainous system of p whether we cut its head off, o in two in the middle—w destroy it.

There is no indefiniteness then. member for North I son) says:

Protection, Sir, notwithstanding in favour of it, is neither

and definite conception of the great W.P. The member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is the most conservative of all. He says he is not for revolution, he would not hurt an existing industry. He wants a custom revenue and would like to see the man who could be elected in any constituency on a policy of direct taxation. He wants no independence or annexation talk, and he thinks that man no friend of Canada who talks independence or annexation at this time. Yet he has sitting very closely to him a gentleman who has been talking independence in the last few months. And the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) has two planks in his policy. One is that legislation should be had to increase the profits of the farmers—

Mr. TARTE. I never said or wrote anything of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. No; let me have a little conversation with my hon. friend. If my hon. friend will turn up the "Hansard" and look at the report of his speech, and if he will look at the manifesto that he read and which he gave to his county, he will find these two statements in it, or else I cannot read French.

Mr. TARTE. Perhaps that is it.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps that is the reason. I will leave it to him. In that manifesto he said that he is going in for such legislation as will raise the value of the farmer's products, and that Mr. Laurier, if he comes into power, will leave two or three columns still standing in the temple of protection.

Mr. TARTE. I never wrote or never said anything of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it must be my bad French. I will look that up, and if I find I am wrong I will withdraw it with great pleasure. That is what my hon. friends say on the negative side.

WHAT THEY ARE OPPOSED TO.

Now, I want to draw the attention of the House to what these gentlemen say when they come to the positive side. Here there is no hesitation; there is no lack of definiteness. Their propaganda is plain and firm, and I want it to ring from one end to the other of this country. What is their propaganda? The hon. member for South Oxford says:

Our policy from first to last has been to destroy this villainous system of protection; I care not whether we cut its head off, or cut its tail off, or cut it in two in the middle—what I want to do is to destroy it.

There is no indefiniteness about that. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlson) says:

Protection, Sir, notwithstanding all that may be said in favour of it, is neither more or less than a

species of slavery. It is a system as indefensible, upon the broad principle of justice, as slavery. It is absolutely and unconditionally slavery.

That is plain; no round-about method in that. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) says:

We have been attacking this policy year after year. It is a cursed system, accursed of God and man. It must be cut down, and not allowed to cumber the ground.

And to make a long story short, the hon. leader of the Opposition declared to-night that his policy was the destruction of every vestige of protection, by bringing the tariff down to a simple revenue basis. Now, Sir, I am glad to have read these statements, and I am glad to have them so heartily applauded by hon. gentlemen opposite. They will not hereafter try to get away from these expressions of their opinions. Now, I ask my hon. friends in this House who believe in the principle of protection, but who may have some grievance now and then, and here and there, with the tariff; I ask them to weigh these assertions; for whatever the proposition that these gentlemen are putting before the House to-night for us to vote upon, it is with the spirit and the purpose of utterly destroying the principle of protection in this country. A man may have a grudge, may have an objection, to some particular excrecence upon the tariff; but he may be at the same time a firm believer in the principle of protection, and may wish to see it survive in this country. I warn such men as those in this House and in the country from playing into the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite on the ground that their present proposition is a harmless one. By one way we have come up to our large commercial and industrial development in this country, we have in these last few years done wonders in the development of our industrial life. Strangers who come here, and people who study our history, acknowledge it frankly and freely. We who live in this country know the blessings that have come from this policy. It may be a fact that to-day there are excrescences upon this policy, that there are details which ought to be carefully examined, and which ought to be made right, that there are certain respects in which the tariff should be reformed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have cast a doubt upon the good faith of the Government in respect of honestly revising the tariff. I stand here to-night to say that what I stated in this regard was stated with the consent of all my colleagues, and in perfect good faith. I ask the country outside to watch carefully, and not be misled by any phrases that these gentlemen may use; but to understand that it is a struggle in which the existence of the principle of protection in this country is at stake. If hon. gentlemen opposite, having set the battle on these lines, push it to the front, and push it to the finish, this country may wake up some fine morning and find its industries destroyed, its factories closed, its employment of

labour discontinued, and multiplied disasters coming upon many a section of this country from Cape Breton to British Columbia. In the proposition before us to-night they put it mildly. It is a little economy, a little revision, and a little of something else; but you must look at the motive that inspires them. A British sovereign held out in the hand and placed within your palm is a good thing. You can buy food and clothing with it; but the same British sovereign pressed tightly upon the opening of your windpipe will bring death, and bring it quickly. Outside of these assertions of ultimate purpose on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite the proposition before the House may combine features which are in themselves harmless, some of which may be right; but it is a coin which is meant to strangle the principle of protection and destroy it in

this country. I ask hon. gentlemen to weigh carefully these matters; to weigh them when they come before the people; to have them put right upon every hustings, and in every assembly in this country, so that people may vote with their eyes open to the full consequences of their action; and if, after doing that, it be found that this battle, pressed to the finish, as it will be, results in a victory for the principle of free trade rather than protection, so be it; but I have a firm and abiding faith that the way to victory does not lie by that path.

OTTAWA

Printed by S. E. DAWSON

Printer to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty
1893